

EXHIBIT 1

**REDACTED VERSION
OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT
TO BE SEALED**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

WAYMO LLC,)
)
Plaintiff,)
vs.) Case No.
) 17-cv-00939-WHA
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;)
OTTOMOTTO, LLC; OTTO TRUCKING LLC,)
)
Defendants.)
_____)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL--OUTSIDE COUNSEL'S EYES ONLY

VIDEOTAPED 30(b)(6) DEPOSITION of WAYMO LLC
by and through its Designated Representative
ASLAN (SHAWN) BANANZADEH
San Francisco, California
Thursday, August 24, 2017
Volume I

Reported by:
MARY J. GOFF
CSR No. 13427
Job No. 2688513

PAGES 1 - 235

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

WAYMO LLC,)
)
Plaintiff,)
vs.) Case No.
) 17-cv-00939-WHA
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;)
9 OTTOMOTTO, LLC; OTTO TRUCKING LLC,)
)
Defendants.)
_____)

Highly Confidential Videotaped Deposition of
ASLAN (SHAWN) BANANZADEH, Volume I, taken on behalf
of Plaintiff Waymo LLC, at Morrison & Foerster LLP,
425 Market Street, 33rd Floor, San Francisco,
California, 94105, beginning at 9:54 a.m. and ending
at 5:53 p.m., on August 24, 2017, before MARY GOFF,
Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 13427.

1 resistor could specify that this resistor should be 11:36:25
2 expensed against the cost for the LiDAR sensor or -- 11:36:29
3 MR. MACK: Objection. 11:36:37
4 Q (BY MS. CHANG) -- the timing board or 11:36:37
5 whatever it is that the resistor is intended to be 11:36:38
6 used for. 11:36:42
7 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:36:43
8 A So it -- when you say -- it -- Waymo set 11:36:44
9 up a system in the time that I have been there? I 11:36:50
10 haven't -- I haven't set up a system to say 11:36:53
11 specifically: This is the part. 11:36:56
12 Like, I don't tell someone: Go back and 11:36:57
13 revise this and tell me the exact part number. 11:37:01
14 Dating back to, let's just say, 2009, I -- 11:37:03
15 I don't know the answer whether somebody told 11:37:07
16 somebody to go give them an individual part number, 11:37:09
17 et cetera. 11:37:14
18 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Do you know if, at Waymo, 11:37:14
19 it's possible to break out each of these GL expenses 11:37:15
20 to correlate it to the various components of Waymo's 11:37:19
21 self-driving car? 11:37:22
22 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:37:22
23 A Like, possible -- again, like, if -- if 11:37:25
24 you told someone hypothetically to go, like, label 11:37:28
25 every P&L they put to an individual part number when 11:37:33

1 they purchased it, theoretically you could do that, 11:37:36

2 I guess, right. 11:37:38

3 Q (BY MS. CHANG) To understand your 11:37:39

4 testimony, you're saying it would be possible for 11:37:40

5 Waymo to retroactively go back and recategorize the 11:37:42

6 expenses? 11:37:49

7 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:37:50

8 A No. No. No, that wasn't my testimony. I 11:37:51

9 -- 11:37:54

10 Q (BY MS. CHANG) I'm just trying to 11:37:55

11 understand whether it's possible -- could we go to 11:37:56

12 Waymo today somewhere and either by looking at the 11:37:58

13 data sources or other information available at 11:38:01

14 Waymo, could we break out each of these GL -- 11:38:04

15 GL account expenses and map them to various 11:38:06

16 components of the self-driving car? 11:38:11

17 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:38:13

18 A I -- I -- I don't know, because I don't 11:38:15

19 know what everyone did historically every time they 11:38:17

20 purchased something. 11:38:20

21 Q (BY MS. CHANG) To your knowledge, as you 11:38:22

22 sit here today, it's not possible to break out each 11:38:23

23 of these GL account expenses to the various 11:38:26

24 components of the self-driving car? 11:38:30

25 MR. MACK: Same objection. 11:38:33

Page 71

1 A So it -- it -- can -- can you just repeat 11:38:34
2 the question? I -- I got lost. 11:38:39
3 Q (BY MS. CHANG) You're the company 11:38:42
4 representative -- 11:38:43
5 A Right. 11:38:43
6 Q -- on the cost of developing the trade 11:38:43
7 secrets? I want to know whether it's possible to 11:38:46
8 break out each of these GL account values and map 11:38:49
9 them to how much of a particular GL account relates 11:38:54
10 to a certain component on the self-driving car. 11:39:01
11 You testified that based on the 11:39:03
12 information in Exhibit 1400, which has Bates label 11:39:05
13 WAYMO-UBER-00027045, that it was not possible to 11:39:11
14 break out each GL account into the components of the 11:39:15
15 self-driving car. 11:39:20
16 Is there information available at Waymo 11:39:21
17 that would allow you to do that? 11:39:23
18 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:39:25
19 A So -- so I mean -- I mean, like, there's 11:39:27
20 the element of, like, did you buy -- because I 11:39:32
21 want -- I want to -- like, there's kind of different 11:39:34
22 ways of looking at it. 11:39:36
23 Did you buy a -- again, like, a resistor 11:39:39
24 for this? And did it -- what did it cost? Right. 11:39:41
25 That's -- that's one way of saying: What did it 11:39:43

1 cost to create that? Right. Well, there's that. 11:39:46

2 In contrast, if you said, for example: 11:39:48

3 What is the cost of the system as a whole, like, 11:39:50

4 insofar as it -- like, it all works together, right 11:39:55

5 like, you -- you know, there's different ways of 11:39:58

6 looking at it. 11:40:00

7 So I -- I'm going to go back to saying 11:40:00

8 that -- like: Could you say a particular part costs 11:40:03

9 this? It would be dependent on what it was coded as 11:40:06

10 and put through, right. But not knowing whether 11:40:09

11 that happened, like, I -- I can't answer that, like, 11:40:11

12 sitting here right now. 11:40:15

13 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Are you aware of any way to 11:40:18

14 break out each of these GL accounts to map onto 11:40:20

15 various components of the self-driving car? 11:40:24

16 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:40:30

17 A Mapping. 11:40:31

18 Q (BY MS. CHANG) So let's take one example. 11:40:31

19 Let's take the "Equipment and Related EXP" 11:40:33

20 GL account. If you look at 2016, there's a very 11:40:38

21 large number that starts with -- or that reads 11:40:47

22 [REDACTED] 11:40:53

23 Do you see that number? 11:40:59

24 A Yeah. I8? Cell -- Cell I8? Is that what 11:41:00

25 you're referring to? Right? 11:41:04

1 Q Yes. 11:41:05

2 A Yes. 11:41:05

3 Q Are you aware of a breakdown of this 11:41:16

4 number at Waymo for each of the components that make 11:41:19

5 up the self-driving car? 11:41:25

6 A So there is -- like, if you go back to the 11:41:27

7 "Raw Data" tab, right, you can obviously divide it 11:41:31

8 up by cost center, right? So that's a breakup of 11:41:33

9 that expense already. 11:41:38

10 Then when it comes to -- and that shows 11:41:41

11 you different, like, budget owners' cost center 11:41:43

12 areas. So that's, like, a division that you could 11:41:46

13 have. 11:41:48

14 As far as, like, part numbers, I think, 11:41:50

15 is -- is, like, you're trying to go farther than 11:41:52

16 saying, like, big budget areas. 11:41:55

17 But then part numbers -- in some instances 11:41:56

18 people will code to a part number. And others, they 11:42:00

19 won't. So it -- it's -- again, it's a possibility, 11:42:03

20 but I -- I don't know for a fact that that breakdown 11:42:06

21 exists. 11:42:09

22 Q Are you aware of any information at Waymo 11:42:15

23 that would indicate how much of the "Equipment and 11:42:21

24 Related EXP" GL account relates to the LiDAR in 11:42:26

25 Waymo's self-driving car? 11:42:32

1 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:42:33

2 A Like, I don't think I can make that 11:42:37

3 determination. Because, again, like, what you view 11:42:39

4 the LiDAR as is -- in the con -- in the context of 11:42:41

5 the whole of the -- the -- the SDS system is 11:42:43

6 something that I don't think I can technically tell 11:42:48

7 you. So I don't think I can sit here and tell you: 11:42:51

8 This is how I would isolate that cost. 11:42:54

9 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Can -- has Waymo isolated 11:42:57

10 that cost? 11:43:00

11 A Which -- which -- sorry. When you say 11:43:00

12 "that cost," what are you referring to again? 11:43:01

13 Q The LiDAR-related cost portion -- sorry. 11:43:04

14 The LiDAR-related portion of the 11:43:07

15 "Equipment and Related EXP" GL account? 11:43:08

16 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:43:12

17 A My understanding is that we have experts 11:43:13

18 who are going to provide the reports and provide, 11:43:16

19 like, a conclusion about a number that relates to 11:43:18

20 that. So at least that's my understanding of what's 11:43:21

21 going on in this litigation. 11:43:24

22 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Does Waymo currently have 11:43:26

23 that information? 11:43:28

24 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:43:30

25 A The -- like, to the extent that the -- the 11:43:34

1 expert has, like, said there's this number that 11:43:37
2 relates to it, I know what that number is. I -- I 11:43:39
3 have seen it in interrogatory responses, yes. 11:43:42
4 Q (BY MS. CHANG) But that number is not 11:43:45
5 indicated in Exhibit 1400? 11:43:47
6 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:43:50
7 A I don't know if that -- that's true. 11:43:55
8 Because the -- the number, I think, is -- is 11:43:56
9 partially derived from the numbers that we provided 11:43:58
10 of how the program has, like, expensed things over 11:44:01
11 time so... 11:44:04
12 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Can you show me where in 11:44:05
13 Exhibit 1400, the LiDAR portion of any of these 11:44:08
14 GL accounts is indicated? 11:44:11
15 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:44:14
16 A Sorry. Again, going back to how the -- 11:44:17
17 the -- what's it called -- the -- the expert 11:44:21
18 formulated the conclusion, my understanding is they 11:44:25
19 used, like, a -- like, the whole is -- like, you 11:44:29
20 can't -- again, like I said, you can't take this 11:44:34
21 thing apart and say: This is it and that's 11:44:36
22 isolated. 11:44:38
23 So you use the whole development cost of 11:44:38
24 program that -- if you wanted to ask on those -- an 11:44:41
25 individual basis, like, I'm familiar with what these 11:44:43

1 numbers are on this and how that was informed. 11:44:46

2 Q But Exhibit 1400 doesn't break out the 11:44:49

3 LiDAR-related expense of "Equipment and Related 11:44:53

4 Expenses" GL account? 11:45:00

5 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:45:02

6 A Again, like, I don't think that I know how 11:45:05

7 to tell you what "LiDAR-related" means. Like -- 11:45:07

8 like, to me, that's a technical thing, and I'm not 11:45:10

9 equipped -- I can tell you what these numbers 11:45:13

10 represent. I can tell you, like, how they're 11:45:16

11 formulated, et cetera. 11:45:17

12 But to the extent that you're asking, if I 11:45:17

13 understand you correctly, like: What is the number 11:45:19

14 to create a LiDAR, I think that's, like, a technical 11:45:21

15 question that an expert could opine on. I can tell 11:45:24

16 you about the numbers, right. 11:45:27

17 Q (BY MS. CHANG) I'm not asking you for 11:45:28

18 technical definition. I just want to know if this 11:45:30

19 spreadsheet has a breakout of the LiDAR-related 11:45:33

20 portion of any of these GL accounts. 11:45:35

21 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:45:37

22 A I mean, I -- I'm not -- like, I -- I just 11:45:39

23 don't -- like, "LiDAR related," to me, like, I 11:45:41

24 can't -- I can't -- I can't understand what this is. 11:45:43

25 Like, if you could help me -- like -- like 11:45:45

1 I have said, like, this doesn't show a part-by-part 11:45:46
2 number, right. But if you're asking for the 11:45:49
3 LiDAR-related cost of, like, developing a LiDAR 11:45:52
4 system in an SDS system, I think this is a 11:45:54
5 fundamentally, like, technical question that I -- 11:45:58
6 I'm not prepared to answer for you, right. 11:45:59

7 Q (BY MS. CHANG) But your testimony is that 11:46:02
8 each of these accounts relates to the expenses for 11:46:03
9 the entire self-driving car? 11:46:05

10 A The -- so this -- this -- these accounts 11:46:08
11 in totality capture the cost of creating a 11:46:10
12 self-driving system within which the LiDAR is an 11:46:14
13 integral part. 11:46:19

14 Q You stated that LiDAR is an integral part 11:46:55
15 of the self-driving system. What other integral 11:46:59
16 parts are you aware of? 11:47:04

17 A I mean, again, my nontechnical 11:47:07
18 understanding is that, like, you need to have LiDAR 11:47:10
19 to do this. Like, that's about as far as my, like, 11:47:12
20 nontechnical understanding of this goes. 11:47:16

21 Q You're not aware of any other integral 11:47:19
22 parts of the self-driving system? 11:47:22

23 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:47:24

24 A The -- like, I don't pretend to -- to say 11:47:24
25 that, like, one is better than the other or 11:47:30

1 anything, but I know that the LiDAR is part of the 11:47:32
2 whole solution. 11:47:35

3 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Are you aware of any other 11:47:36
4 part of the whole solution for Waymo's self-driving 11:47:39
5 system? 11:47:43

6 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 11:47:44

7 A I -- I believe -- like, again, my 11:47:45
8 nontechnical understanding is that there are other 11:47:48
9 parts to it. But I -- I wasn't prepared here to 11:47:50
10 talk about what the technical elements of the 11:47:53
11 self-driving system are. 11:47:56

12 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Are there other integral 11:47:57
13 parts of the Waymo self-driving system, other than 11:47:57
14 LiDAR that you're aware of as you sit here today 11:48:00
15 you? 11:48:04

16 MR. MACK: Objection, form; beyond the 11:48:05
17 scope. 11:48:05

18 A Like, I don't -- I -- I don't -- like, I 11:48:07
19 can't say what are other technical -- or sorry. I 11:48:10
20 -- I don't know what to -- or I don't know what 11:48:14
21 other integral parts are, no. 11:48:18

22 Q (BY MS. CHANG) But you would characterize 11:48:19
23 LiDAR as an integral part? 11:48:21

24 MR. MACK: Objection, form; beyond the 11:48:23
25 scope. 11:48:23

1 A It -- in a nontechnical way without having 11:48:24
2 any kind of, like, technical training or 11:48:28
3 understanding, yes, I just did. 11:48:30
4 MR. MACK: Esther, I think we have been 11:48:33
5 going well over an hour, if now is a good time to 11:48:35
6 break. 11:48:40
7 MS. CHANG: Yeah. 11:48:40
8 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are off the record 11:48:41
9 at 11:49 a.m. 11:48:41
10 (A break was taken from 11:49 a.m. to 11:48:44
11 12:37 p.m.) 11:48:48
12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. We are back on 12:36:02
13 the record at 12:37 p.m. 12:36:35
14 Q (BY MS. CHANG) I'm handing you what's been 12:36:43
15 marked as Exhibit 1520. Exhibit 1520 is 12:36:45
16 "Plaintiff's Amended Fourth Supplemental Objections 12:37:03
17 and Responses to Uber's First Set of 12:37:07
18 Interrogatories, Nos. 1 through 11." 12:37:09
19 Do you recognize this document? 12:37:15
20 A Yes, I believe so. 12:37:16
21 Q You previously testified that in 12:37:46
22 preparation to provide testimony in your capacity as 12:37:48
23 the corporate witness for the cost aspect of 12:37:56
24 Topic 9, that you had reviewed responses to 12:38:00
25 interrogatory requests. 12:38:05

1 Are these the responses that you reviewed? 12:38:06

2 A Yes, I believe so. 12:38:08

3 Q If you turn to page 61, you'll see 12:38:20

4 Interrogatory 6 listed here. And it reads, 12:38:28

5 Separately for each alleged Waymo trade secret 12:38:33

6 identified in response to Interrogatory No. 1, 12:38:37

7 describe how long it took and how much it cost to 12:38:40

8 develop. 12:38:43

9 Do you recall reviewing the response to 12:38:47

10 Interrogatory No. 6? 12:38:53

11 A I -- I don't recall reviewing that 12:38:54

12 specific one, no. 12:38:58

13 Q Did you help prepare the response to 12:39:08

14 Interrogatory No. 6? 12:39:12

15 MR. MACK: Objection, form. Again, I'll 12:39:13

16 just caution the witness not to reveal the substance 12:39:19

17 of any attorney/client privileged communications, 12:39:23

18 but you may answer. 12:39:25

19 A So like, to the extent there are, like, 12:39:26

20 dollar values in here and to the extent that those 12:39:30

21 dollar values were derived from, like, this report 12:39:33

22 that we have on the screen right now, then you could 12:39:36

23 perhaps say that, like, I helped prepare this. 12:39:40

24 But I did not, like, directly draft or -- 12:39:43

25 or answer -- answer this in any way, if -- if that 12:39:47

Page 81

1	answers your question.	12:39:51
2	Q (BY MS. CHANG) Going back to Exhibit 2090,	12:39:53
3	you were designated as Waymo's corporate	12:40:10
4	representative to testify to the cost of developing	12:40:14
5	each of the alleged Waymo trade secrets selected for	12:40:18
6	trial.	12:40:21
7	Did you review a list of the alleged Waymo	12:40:23
8	trade secrets selected for trial?	12:40:27
9	A So my understanding is -- is that there	12:40:35
10	were many trade secrets at issue in this case. Some	12:40:37
11	of them -- like, I think some of them are no longer	12:40:40
12	part of the case. I don't -- I don't know exactly,	12:40:45
13	to be honest.	12:40:47
14	But I believe there are some at issue, and	12:40:48
15	I -- and I did see those numbers that are still at	12:40:51
16	issue in the case.	12:40:55
17	Q Did you also review the descriptions or	12:40:56
18	the substance of the trade secret numbers? You --	12:40:58
19	you mentioned that you had reviewed the numbers?	12:41:00
20	A Right.	12:41:03
21	Q Did you also review the substance or the	12:41:03
22	description of that trade secret number?	12:41:06
23	A I believe I looked at a document that	12:41:10
24	listed them and had, like, detailed explanations. I	12:41:12
25	didn't -- I didn't read in detail any of them, no,	12:41:16

1 so I... 12:41:18

2 Q Turning to page 103 of Exhibit 1520, 12:41:37

3 trade -- you'll see that there are a "Trade 12:41:45

4 Secret 2" header. 12:41:55

5 A Um-hum. 12:41:57

6 Q And under this section it reads, 12:41:58

7 Information potentially relevant to determining such 12:42:10

8 cost estimates includes information that has been 12:42:15

9 produced at WAYMO-UBER-00027045, 12:42:19

10 WAYMO-UBER-00014506, WAYMO-UBER-00012830, 12:42:20

11 WAYMO-UBER-00014078, and WAYMO-UBER-00014489. 12:42:31

12 WAYMO-UBER-27045 is Exhibit 1400, and 12:42:42

13 that's the spreadsheet that we have been looking at. 12:42:48

14 A Okay. 12:42:52

15 Q I'm going to mark as exhibits, the 12:42:54

16 remaining documents that are cited in this 12:42:58

17 interrogatory response. 12:43:02

18 Exhibit 1413, which I have just handed 12:43:53

19 you, is the next document, WAYMO-UBER-00014506. So 12:43:56

20 did I give you the wrong -- no, I didn't. Is 12:44:07

21 that -- is that the document that you have? 12:44:10

22 A Yes. 12:44:13

23 Q Have you seen this document before? 12:44:17

24 A Yes. I saw it yesterday. 12:44:19

25 Q What is your understanding of what this 12:44:22

1 document is? 12:44:24

2 A This is the Term Sheet of the acquisition 12:44:27

3 of 510 Systems. 12:44:31

4 Q Had you seen it before yesterday? 12:44:34

5 A No. 12:44:35

6 Q The next document, WAYMO-UBER-00012830, 12:44:38

7 was previously marked as Exhibit 1414. This 12:44:46

8 document is the "Agreement and Plan of Merger By and 12:45:12

9 Among Google Inc., Plus 490 LLC; 510 Systems LLC; 12:45:16

10 each of the members of 510 Systems LLC; and with 12:45:20

11 respect to Articles VI, VIII, IX, and X only, 12:45:24

12 Anthony Levandowski, as member representative; and 12:45:26

13 U.S. Bank National Association as escrow agent," 12:45:30

14 dated as of July 28, 2011. 12:45:34

15 Do you recognize this document? 12:45:36

16 A Only insofar as I saw it yesterday. 12:45:41

17 Q Had you seen it before yesterday? 12:45:45

18 A No. 12:45:46

19 Q The next document listed in Waymo's 12:45:49

20 response to Interrogatory No. 6 for Trade Secret 2 12:45:54

21 on page 103 of Exhibit 1520 is WAYMO-UBER-00014078. 12:45:59

22 This document was previously marked as Exhibit 1415. 12:46:12

23 Exhibit 1415 is the "Google Inc. Project 12:46:33

24 Chauffeur Bonus Program." 12:46:39

25 Do you recognize this document? 12:46:41

1	A	Yes, insofar as I saw it yesterday.	12:46:45
2	Q	Before yesterday, had you seen this	12:46:48
3		document?	12:46:49
4	A	I hadn't seen the document, but I was	12:46:51
5		generally familiar with the 2011 special bonus plan.	12:46:54
6	Q	The final document listed in Waymo's	12:46:59
7		Interrogatory Response No. 6 for Trade Secret 2 is	12:47:02
8		WAYMO-UBER-00014489.	12:47:06
9		This document was previously marked as	12:47:13
10		Exhibit 1416. Exhibit 1416 is a letter from Google,	12:47:16
11		in particular, David [REDACTED], who was vice president	12:47:32
12		of corporate development at the time, to Anthony	12:47:38
13		Levandowksi, dated April 13, 2011.	12:47:40
14		Do you recognize this document?	12:47:46
15	A	Only insofar as I read it yesterday.	12:47:49
16	Q	Before yesterday had you seen this	12:47:53
17		document?	12:47:55
18	A	No.	12:47:55
19	Q	Looking back at Exhibit 1520, which is	12:48:47
20		Waymo's interrogatory responses, on page 103, the	12:48:50
21		next sentence reads, That information -- referring	12:48:55
22		to the five documents listed before that sentence --	12:49:00
23		reflects that costs Waymo necessarily incurred for	12:49:10
24		the development, Trade Secret 2 are in the	12:49:13
25		[REDACTED]	12:49:18

1 Did you help prepare that [REDACTED] 12:49:24

2 range number for Trade Secret 2? 12:49:28

3 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 12:49:30

4 A So -- so -- so again, insofar as that 12:49:34

5 number is derived from the numbers that you see of, 12:49:37

6 like, the historical spend at Waymo, to the extent 12:49:39

7 it incorporates those numbers, I would say yes. 12:49:44

8 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Do you know how that 12:49:48

9 [REDACTED] number was calculated? 12:49:54

10 A So my understanding is that -- and this 12:49:59

11 is, I believe, a -- a formulation based on the 12:50:04

12 expert's calculations. But what -- what it is is a 12:50:08

13 summation -- am I allowed to alter this just so I 12:50:12

14 can read it easier? Can I make it into dollars? 12:50:19

15 No? 12:50:23

16 Q Yes, we -- yes, we can, but I think we 12:50:24

17 would then need to mark it as new exhibit, so -- 12:50:25

18 A Okay. 12:50:28

19 Q -- what we'll do is we'll mark this as 12:50:28

20 Exhibit 2091. 12:50:31

21 A It -- it's okay. I don't -- I won't 12:50:36

22 change it, just to keep it -- sorry. 12:50:37

23 Q Are you sure? 12:50:39

24 A Yeah. Yeah. 12:50:40

25 Q Okay. 12:50:41

1 A Sorry about that. So my understanding is 12:50:41
2 that because of the nature of the development of the 12:50:48
3 program as a whole, right, what it was is a -- kind 12:50:54
4 of a calculation of historical spend through the end 12:50:57
5 of 2015. 12:51:00

6 So if -- on the screen you can see that 12:51:02
7 essentially I'm -- I'm highlighting all the cells in 12:51:04
8 Row 16, Columns B through H. 12:51:08

9 And in the bottom corner, Excel does a 12:51:12
10 sum. So what that sum is saying is that this is 12:51:15
11 approximately [REDACTED] 12:51:17

12 Q For the record, the exact sum that is 12:51:40
13 shown in Exhibit 1400 when you highlight Cells B16 12:51:47
14 to H16, is -- 12:51:52

15 A Do you want me to read it out? 12:52:00

16 Q -- you can read it out. Or I was going 12:52:02
17 to, but you can. 12:52:04

18 A Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Okay. 12:52:05

19 Q It is [REDACTED] is that right? 12:52:07

20 A Yes, that's what the screen shows. 12:52:20

21 Q And that's the number that is the basis 12:52:23
22 for the [REDACTED] range that's shown as the 12:52:26
23 development cost for Trade Secret 2? 12:52:33

24 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 12:52:37

25 A That's -- that's my understanding of how 12:52:37

1 it was formulated. 12:52:39

2 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Do you know what Trade 12:52:41

3 Secret 2 is? 12:52:42

4 A Like -- like, in technical detail, no. 12:52:46

5 Q In any level of detail? 12:52:50

6 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 12:52:52

7 A I -- I know that it's at issue in the 12:52:57

8 case, but I don't -- like, I don't know the 12:53:00

9 technical details of it, no. 12:53:02

10 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Do you know anything about 12:53:03

11 Trade Secret 2? 12:53:04

12 A In -- I -- I mean, I didn't ask -- like, 12:53:07

13 no, I didn't ask detailed questions about Trade 12:53:10

14 Secret 2. 12:53:13

15 Q What do you know about Trade Secret 2, 12:53:14

16 other than that it's \$ [REDACTED] to develop? 12:53:15

17 A That to the extent it is -- take -- how do 12:53:23

18 I say this? 12:53:29

19 That its development was not limited to, 12:53:30

20 a -- like, a discrete point in time. And it -- 12:53:33

21 it -- the formulation of it and the basis for -- 12:53:36

22 thereby the basis of the calculation is that it is 12:53:37

23 the kind of -- from inception to the date of the 12:53:43

24 cutoff of -- whatever informs that cutoff date is 12:53:47

25 how it -- it's informed, right. 12:53:52

1 So there's a development time. It's not 12:53:52
2 like a discrete thing with, like, a discrete item. 12:53:54
3 It is a totality. And that's why, you know... 12:53:57
4 Q Other than the number, what do you know 12:54:03
5 about the technology that's captured by Trade 12:54:08
6 Secret 2? 12:54:11
7 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 12:54:12
8 A So what I know about technology is that it 12:54:21
9 was developed at Waymo. That would be -- and it was 12:54:23
10 technology that was developed in the program as a 12:54:32
11 whole. 12:54:36
12 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Do you know what aspect of 12:54:36
13 the technology that was developed by Waymo that 12:54:38
14 Trade Secret 2 relates to? 12:54:42
15 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 12:54:44
16 A Well, I think based off of my 12:54:45
17 understanding of how it was calculated, aspect -- 12:54:47
18 aspect is a little -- I guess I would take issue 12:54:51
19 with the word "aspect." Is that -- it -- it's a -- 12:54:55
20 it's a trade secret that is kind of comprehensive in 12:54:58
21 the program as a whole. 12:55:01
22 Like -- but again, that's just a -- like, 12:55:01
23 a nontechnical understanding of, like, how this 12:55:03
24 number was calculated. And I'm kind of deriving it 12:55:06
25 based off of that calculation. 12:55:09

1 Q (BY MS. CHANG) If you turn to page 172 of 12:55:11
2 Exhibit 1520. 12:55:14
3 A I'm sorry. What page again? 12:55:16
4 Q 172. 12:55:19
5 A Okay. 12:55:20
6 Q This is Waymo's Response to 12:55:36
7 Interrogatory No. 6 with respect to Trade Secret 25. 12:55:39
8 If you look in the middle of the first paragraph, 12:55:43
9 under that header it reads, Information potentially 12:55:48
10 relevant to determining such cost estimates includes 12:55:52
11 information that has been produced at 12:55:55
12 WAYMO-UBER-00027045, WAYMO-UBER-00014506 12:55:58
13 WAYMO-UBER-00012830, WAYMO-UBER-00014078, and 12:56:06
14 WAYMO-UBER-00014489. 12:56:15
15 I can represent to you that those are the 12:56:20
16 same five documents that were cited for Trade 12:56:23
17 Secret 2 that we just looked at. 12:56:26
18 The next sentence reads, That information 12:56:30
19 reflects that costs Waymo necessarily incurred for 12:56:34
20 the development of Trade Secret 25 are in the 12:56:39
21 [REDACTED] 12:56:43
22 What is the basis of the [REDACTED] 12:57:02
23 range number cited for Trade Secret 25 in Waymo's 12:57:05
24 response to Interrogatory No. 6 for Trade Secret 25? 12:57:09
25 A So I -- again, I think my understanding of 12:57:16

1	how the expert who created that value is that they	12:57:22
2	took the numbers of spend historically since	12:57:26
3	inception through a certain date. And like, same as	12:57:28
4	the previous one is that it goes through on --	12:57:32
5	whichever exhibit number we labeled the screen.	12:57:35

6	Q	1400.	12:57:41
---	---	-------	----------

7	A	Sorry. Yeah, 1400 is, again, from a --	12:57:42
8		2009 through end of year 2015, which represents that	12:57:44
9		approximately [REDACTED]	12:57:48

10	Q It's the same calculation that was used	12:57:57
11	for Trade Secret 2 that we previously discussed?	12:58:00

12	A	So -- so when you say "the same	12:58:05
13		calculation," I -- like, again, the -- to the	12:58:07
14		extent, like, an expert created that calculation,	12:58:11
15		I -- I can't tell you how precisely they calculate	12:58:13
16		it, right.	12:58:16

17	But my understanding is that it is a	12:58:17
18	culmination of all of the work that precedes -- took	12:58:19
19	-- took place preceding. And therefore, perhaps in	12:58:23
20	broad strokes it's a similar calculation. I don't	12:58:28
21	want to speak out of turn and say it's, like, the	12:58:30
22	same calculation.	12:58:33

23	Q	I just want to make sure that I'm	12:58:34
24		understanding your testimony. You testified that	12:58:36
25		Trade Secret 2, which cited a [REDACTED] was	12:58:38

1 the sum of Cells B16 to H16 of Exhibit 1400, and 12:58:43
2 that was for Trade Secret 2? 12:58:52
3 A Yeah, the -- the last -- yes, correct. 12:58:54
4 Q And now we're looking at Trade Secret 25, 12:58:56
5 which also cites a [REDACTED] cost? 12:58:59
6 A Um-hum. 12:59:03
7 Q The calculation for that [REDACTED] 12:59:03
8 number, is it also the sum of Cells B16 to H16 of 12:59:06
9 Exhibit 1400? 12:59:12
10 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 12:59:14
11 A Yes, those same numbers inform that 12:59:19
12 number. 12:59:22
13 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Why is it that only the 12:59:23
14 costs incurred in 2009 through 2015 are used to 12:59:28
15 calculate the [REDACTED] cost estimate for Trade 12:59:34
16 Secrets 2 and 25? 12:59:41
17 A Sorry. Why is -- why only those years as 12:59:46
18 opposed to what other years, I guess? 12:59:48
19 Q Why wasn't 2016 included? 12:59:52
20 A Well, my understanding based off of, 12:59:56
21 again, like, the trade secret being a technical 12:59:58
22 thing is that this says it took a period of time. 01:00:00
23 And that secret -- again, not being 01:00:03
24 technically minded about what a trade secret is 01:00:07
25 legally defined as or anything else, it's -- it's 01:00:10

1 formulation took that span of time; and therefore, 01:00:14
2 they're capturing that period of time's expense, 01:00:16
3 therefore. 01:00:22
4 Q Your testimony is that the development of 01:00:23
5 Trade Secret 25 incurred cost only up through 2015? 01:00:27
6 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:00:34
7 A My -- my testimony is that that is my 01:00:37
8 understanding of how it was calculated, yes. 01:00:39
9 Q (BY MS. CHANG) The same answer for Trade 01:00:41
10 Secret 2? 01:00:45
11 A Again, like, my under -- my understanding 01:00:48
12 is, like, that's the method the expert used to 01:00:50
13 surmise the -- the data -- the costs incurred based 01:00:55
14 upon historical spend that we -- that I -- that we 01:00:58
15 provided. 01:01:02
16 Q Do you know what the technology, that 01:01:08
17 Trade Secret 25 relates to, is? 01:01:11
18 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:01:16
19 A I don't know the specific technology or 01:01:20
20 technological elements that it informs. My 01:01:23
21 understanding is it's -- it's technology that is -- 01:01:27
22 was developed within Waymo Chauffeur -- 01:01:30
23 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Is that -- 01:01:33
24 A -- but that would be the extent of it. 01:01:34
25 Q You don't know any more details regarding 01:01:35

1 Trade Secret 25? 01:01:38

2 A No, I don't have any more details. 01:01:40

3 Q You testified that Trade Secret 2 incurred 01:01:44

4 a [REDACTED] cost for development. You also 01:01:47

5 testified that Trade Secret 25 incurred the same 01:01:52

6 [REDACTED] cost for development. 01:01:57

7 Is there any chance that costs of 01:02:20

8 development is being double counted between Trade 01:02:23

9 Secret 2 and Trade Secret 25? 01:02:26

10 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:02:29

11 A So one thing in -- in answering your 01:02:30

12 question, I think you said that my testimony was 01:02:33

13 that it costs [REDACTED] to formulate those two 01:02:36

14 trade secrets. 01:02:40

15 So I just want to say first that, like, 01:02:40

16 that's -- that's not my testimony. What -- what I'm 01:02:41

17 saying is that insofar is that an expert calculated 01:02:43

18 this, it's -- I'm showing the -- my testimony is 01:02:46

19 that in the years 2009 through 2015, those were the 01:02:49

20 expenses incurred. 01:02:54

21 With respect to your -- the -- the core of 01:02:56

22 the question or, like, the latter part of what you 01:02:59

23 just said of: Is there a double count, I don't 01:03:01

24 think I am technically minded enough to say whether 01:03:05

25 that is true or not. 01:03:10

1 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Do you understand that you 01:03:11
2 were designated corporate witness, so you're 01:03:13
3 supposed to do testify on behalf of the company 01:03:16
4 regarding the cost of each of the alleged trade 01:03:19
5 secrets? Are you not prepared to testify as to that 01:03:21
6 today? 01:03:25
7 A So -- so I'm -- I'm prepared to testify. 01:03:26
8 And -- and I have been trying to testify about the 01:03:29
9 numbers and the costs incurred by this program. 01:03:32
10 I am not technically minded to say that a 01:03:37
11 trade secret involved this cost versus that cost. I 01:03:39
12 think that's a more expert-based formulation. 01:03:44
13 And I'm not prepared or capable of -- of 01:03:49
14 creating -- like, I'm not an expert, right. Like, 01:03:52
15 my understanding is you -- you have expert reports 01:03:54
16 on these kinds of things, and there will be a whole, 01:03:56
17 you know, rigmarole around that. 01:03:58
18 But I am prepared to tell you about what 01:04:01
19 are the costs and what we have been discussing about 01:04:01
20 what the expenses that we're showing in these 01:04:04
21 various years. 01:04:07
22 Q If I understand your testimony correctly, 01:04:08
23 you're prepared to testify about the costs incurred 01:04:10
24 by Waymo's self-driving car program, but you are not 01:04:12
25 prepared to testify about the costs of each 01:04:19

1 individual trade secret; is that right? 01:04:22

2 MR. MACK: Objection to form. 01:04:23

3 A So again, insofar as that -- in this 01:04:26

4 interrogatory response there is a response that says 01:04:30

5 the trade secret costs [REDACTED] I can tell you 01:04:31

6 what numbers inform that. 01:04:36

7 So -- so yes, there's an -- there's an 01:04:37

8 expert conclusion about this, and I can help show 01:04:39

9 you -- like, to the two preceding questions you 01:04:42

10 asked, I showed you how that [REDACTED] was 01:04:45

11 informed. So that extent, I am providing my 01:04:48

12 testimony and the -- the basis for that [REDACTED] 01:04:51

13 calculation. 01:04:54

14 Q (BY MS. CHANG) You know how the number was 01:04:54

15 calculated, but you're not offering any testimony as 01:04:56

16 to how that number relates to each of the trade 01:04:59

17 secrets? 01:05:02

18 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:05:02

19 A I don't -- I don't understand what you 01:05:05

20 mean by "how it relates to each of the trade 01:05:06

21 secrets." 01:05:09

22 Q (BY MS. CHANG) You're not providing any 01:05:09

23 testimony that -- for example, where it says, Trade 01:05:11

24 Secret 2 costs [REDACTED], you're not offering 01:05:14

25 that Trade Secret 2 actually costs [REDACTED] 01:05:17

1	you're just offering testimony about how	01:05:19
2	[REDACTED] was calculated?	01:05:22
3	MR. MACK: Objection, form.	01:05:26
4	A Sorry. Sorry. Like, let me -- let me try	01:05:30
5	to -- can -- can you repeat the question? It's kind	01:05:34
6	of long, so I -- I don't want to get lost in it.	01:05:37
7	MS. CHANG: Could you read the question	01:05:40
8	back to the witness?	01:05:41
9	(The Reporter read the record as follows:	01:05:43
10	QUESTION: You're not providing any testimony	01:05:43
11	that -- for example, where it says, Trade Secret 2	01:05:43
12	costs [REDACTED], you're not offering that Trade	01:05:43
13	Secret 2 actually costs [REDACTED]; you're just	01:05:43
14	offering testimony about how [REDACTED] was	01:05:43
15	calculated?)	01:05:43
16	MR. MACK: Same objection.	01:06:15
17	A So my understanding is that -- that these	01:06:17
18	trade secrets are a development over time; and	01:06:21
19	therefore, that -- it takes all of the preceding	01:06:27
20	work.	01:06:30
21	And to the extent that trade secret was	01:06:30
22	formulated from inception of the program through the	01:06:33
23	time period that we marked on that at the end of the	01:06:37
24	year, which it's -- it's now blacked out, but I	01:06:40
25	think it was 2015 or 2016, that is the cost of the	01:06:42

Page 97

1 trade secret. 01:06:46

2 Q (BY MS. CHANG) You are testifying that -- 01:06:48

3 it is your testimony under oath that Trade Secret 2 01:06:49

4 costs [REDACTED] 01:06:54

5 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:06:57

6 A Again, to -- to the extent the expert 01:06:58

7 formulated that and -- and the basis is that all of 01:07:01

8 the work took -- took -- it's all of the preceding 01:07:03

9 work up until that time and that our -- the -- 01:07:06

10 the program's historical spend is that, then -- then 01:07:09

11 yes, consistent with that, [REDACTED] is a correct 01:07:12

12 number. 01:07:16

13 Q (BY MS. CHANG) But you don't know what 01:07:16

14 Trade Secret 2 actually is? 01:07:17

15 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:07:19

16 A The -- the discrete technical elements of 01:07:21

17 it, no. 01:07:23

18 Q (BY MS. CHANG) And you don't know what 01:07:25

19 Trade Secret 25 is? 01:07:27

20 MR. MACK: Same objection. 01:07:28

21 A Again, the -- the discrete technical 01:07:29

22 elements of it, no. I -- like, to the extent it was 01:07:32

23 formulated over time and it is -- it is a product of 01:07:34

24 work since the inception of a program, that's -- 01:07:37

25 that's what I understand. 01:07:39

1 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Do you know if there was 01:07:46
2 any chance of double counting between the technology 01:07:47
3 that is claimed in Trade Secret 2 and the technology 01:07:50
4 that is claimed in Trade Secret 25? 01:07:54
5 MR. MACK: Objection to form. 01:07:57
6 A I -- like, what -- what would you consider 01:08:01
7 double counting? 01:08:06
8 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Claiming the claim cost 01:08:13
9 twice. 01:08:15
10 A Between -- between -- so -- so saying the 01:08:16
11 costs of developing one trade secret versus the 01:08:19
12 other are duplicative? 01:08:21
13 Q Yes. 01:08:26
14 A Without -- without understanding the 01:08:27
15 technical elements of -- of the trade secrets, 01:08:29
16 which -- which I admittedly don't understand the 01:08:30
17 technical elements, I -- I don't know that I can 01:08:34
18 answer that. 01:08:35
19 Q How are you able to testify that Trade 01:08:36
20 Secret 25 costs [REDACTED] if you don't understand 01:08:38
21 the technical details that are claimed by Trade 01:08:42
22 Secret 25? 01:08:45
23 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:08:46
24 A Again, because -- my understanding is -- 01:08:49
25 is that the trade secret was formulated since the 01:08:50

1 inception of the program. And it is the totality of 01:08:55
2 the technology as whole that -- that allows the 01:08:57
3 system to work. And therefore, all of the expenses 01:09:01
4 that come through that year that we ended on is why 01:09:03
5 that number is right. 01:09:06

6 So it's -- it's the -- the fact that a 01:09:07
7 given trade secret is a part of this entire 01:09:12
8 solution; and therefore, we took the expense of the 01:09:15
9 entire program and took them over a period of time 01:09:17
10 to what is determined as the date where it's, like, 01:09:19
11 formulated or -- not -- like, I don't know how to 01:09:23
12 describe it in whatever might be the applicable 01:09:25
13 term. 01:09:28

14 But that period of time you then take that 01:09:28
15 whole expense of the whole exclusion and say you 01:09:30
16 have now -- it's come to fruition, so to speak or 01:09:33
17 whatever, and that's how you will come up with the 01:09:34
18 [REDACTED] 01:09:37

19 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Your testimony is that 01:09:38
20 Trade Secret 2 costs [REDACTED] to develop; is 01:09:40
21 that right? 01:09:44

22 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:09:44

23 A My testimony is that to the extent that 01:09:47
24 the -- the expert has surmised that this is, like, a 01:09:49
25 full-on, like, evolution and it -- all of the steps 01:09:53

1 preceding takes time to create the solution. You 01:09:59
2 take all of that spend, and it's [REDACTED] of 01:10:03
3 spend that occurred during that time. And 01:10:05
4 therefore, that's the way you come up to the 01:10:06
5 [REDACTED] range identified in the interrogatory. 01:10:09
6 Q (BY MS. CHANG) It's your testimony that 01:10:12
7 Trade Secret 25 costs [REDACTED] to develop; is 01:10:14
8 that right? 01:10:17
9 MR. MACK: Same objection. 01:10:18
10 A I -- I would answer that in the same way I 01:10:19
11 did the preceding question. 01:10:22
12 Q (BY MS. CHANG) What is your answer to the 01:10:23
13 question: What was the cost of developing Trade 01:10:24
14 Secret 2 and Trade Secret 25? 01:10:27
15 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:10:32
16 A So it -- to -- to -- what was the cost of 01:10:33
17 developing the trade secret? 01:10:38
18 Q (BY MS. CHANG) To clarify, the question 01:10:41
19 is: What was the cost of developing Trade Secret 2 01:10:42
20 and Trade Secret 25? So I want to know the combined 01:10:46
21 cost of developing those two trade secrets. 01:10:51
22 A I -- I don't know that I could answer 01:10:54
23 that, because I don't have, again, the technical 01:10:55
24 element of what the trade secret is. 01:10:57
25 I think that's -- that's something that I 01:10:58

Page 101

1 don't know. But to the extent that -- like, if an 01:11:02
2 expert were to help -- like, tell me how you capture 01:11:05
3 those things, and we said: Well, is there, like, 01:11:09
4 this time element, for example, or something of that 01:11:12
5 sort, then I could look at that amount of time or 01:11:15
6 however and then come up with a number. Kind of 01:11:17
7 like what I have been describing in the preceding 01:11:19
8 answers. 01:11:22

9 Q You testified that Trade Secret 2 used the 01:11:22
10 same calculation as Trade Secret 25? 01:11:24

11 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:11:30

12 A Like -- so I -- I don't think I used the 01:11:31
13 word "calculation." But again, I think that we said 01:11:34
14 that in a similar manner, like, you took the whole 01:11:37
15 program's spend from inception to the time where 01:11:41
16 that trade secret was -- is determined to have, 01:11:44
17 like, come to fruition or whatever. 01:11:45

18 And you take all of that spend, because 01:11:48
19 these trade secrets are part of an integrated 01:11:51
20 whole -- like, it's a whole solution, right. And 01:11:54
21 that's my understanding of how that determination 01:11:56
22 was made. 01:11:57

23 Q (BY MS. CHANG) But isn't the calculation 01:11:59
24 of Trade Secret 2 based on that analysis, the same 01:12:02
25 way that you're calculating the cost for Trade 01:12:06

1 Secret 25? 01:12:08

2 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:12:11

3 Q (BY MS. CHANG) You seem to be implying 01:12:12

4 that the calculation is not the same, so I'm just 01:12:13

5 trying to figure out exactly what your testimony is 01:12:16

6 with respect to the calculations. 01:12:20

7 A Sure. And -- and -- again, like -- like I 01:12:21

8 said earlier -- I think a bit earlier is that -- 01:12:24

9 like, the precise calculation of what informs and 01:12:25

10 costs of the trade secret, I think it requires 01:12:29

11 certain technical elements. 01:12:31

12 But to the extent that it was a 01:12:32

13 time-based, like, evolution of the entire 01:12:35

14 technological solution, to the extent that is what I 01:12:39

15 understand of it, then perhaps it -- then in that 01:12:42

16 vein, yes. But again, I'm not the -- the -- the 01:12:47

17 expert who calculated that number, per se. 01:12:49

18 Q Okay. Stepping back, you keep on 01:12:53

19 mentioning an "expert." Is there a particular 01:12:54

20 expert you're referring to? 01:12:56

21 A I'm assuming who -- whichever expert 01:12:58

22 that -- it says "will be the subject of expert 01:13:01

23 testimony" here in the interrogatory. 01:13:05

24 Q That's true. I believe Waymo's experts 01:13:07

25 will be using this interrogatory response. But 01:13:10

Page 104

1 I can represent to you that those are the 01:15:09
2 same five documents that were cited for Trade 01:15:12
3 Secret 2 and Trade Secret 25 that we just looked at. 01:15:15
4 The next sentence reads, That information 01:15:18
5 reflects that costs Waymo necessarily incurred for 01:15:23
6 the development of Trade Secret 90 are in the 01:15:27
7 [REDACTED] range. 01:15:31
8 What was the basis for calculating that 01:15:33
9 [REDACTED] cost estimate? 01:15:36
10 A So again, my understanding is that it is a 01:15:41
11 cost that captures the entire program spend from 01:15:43
12 inception to the period of time where it stops -- I 01:15:47
13 think it's 2015, 2016, that [REDACTED] that you round up 01:15:54
14 to [REDACTED] 01:15:59
15 It is informed by those same sets of 01:16:00
16 numbers for the totality of the program spend for 01:16:04
17 that period of time. 01:16:05
18 Q The calculation that was the basis of the 01:16:06
19 [REDACTED] cost estimate for Trade Secret 90 is 01:16:09
20 the same calculation that was done for Trade 01:16:13
21 Secret 2 and Trade Secret 25? 01:16:16
22 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:16:18
23 A Again, my understanding being that it 01:16:23
24 covers the -- the time period for the formulation of 01:16:24
25 that trade secret, without knowing the technical 01:16:27

1 elements of it, is -- is a time period that spans 01:16:29
2 the program's total spend of [REDACTED] 01:16:32
3 Q (BY MS. CHANG) And that calculation is the 01:16:36
4 sum of Cells B16 to H16 in Exhibit 1400? 01:16:40
5 A I'll -- I'll accept that. I don't see it 01:16:50
6 on the screen, but I believe so. It's -- it's the 01:16:52
7 cells that I had highlighted earlier. 01:16:53
8 Q And that's the same [REDACTED] 01:16:58
9 A Correct. 01:17:02
10 Q [REDACTED] number that we have been 01:17:02
11 looking at? 01:17:05
12 A Correct. 01:17:05
13 Q Do you know what -- the technical aspects 01:17:10
14 that is claimed by Trade Secret 90? 01:17:20
15 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:17:24
16 A I'm not familiar with the -- the precise 01:17:25
17 individual technical aspects of -- or sorry. Let me 01:17:29
18 rephrase. 01:17:31
19 I'm not -- I'm not familiar with the -- 01:17:31
20 the technical aspects of the individual trade 01:17:33
21 secret. My understanding is that insofar as it is 01:17:38
22 part of the entirety of this self-driving system. 01:17:42
23 Therefore, all of the costs of the program since 01:17:45
24 inception to the time are what then informs that 01:17:48
25 [REDACTED] number. 01:17:52

1 Q (BY MS. CHANG) If I understand your 01:17:54
2 testimony correctly, the costs of the program from 01:17:56
3 inception to 2015 forms the basis for the 01:18:05
4 development cost for Trade Secret 2, Trade 01:18:12
5 Secret 25, and Trade Secret 90; is that correct? 01:18:15
6 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:18:20
7 A Can I get the question read back? 01:18:24
8 Q (BY MS. CHANG) If I understand your 01:18:28
9 testimony correctly, the costs of the self-driving 01:18:29
10 car program from inception to 2015 forms the basis 01:18:32
11 for the development cost for Trade Secret 2, Trade 01:18:36
12 Secret 25, and -- and now Trade Secret 90? 01:18:39
13 MR. MACK: Same objection. 01:18:45
14 A I -- I believe so, yes, if I understand 01:18:48
15 your question. 01:18:52
16 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Is there a part of the 01:18:54
17 question that you don't understand? 01:18:55
18 A So -- sorry. Can -- can you read it back 01:18:57
19 one more time? I apologize. 01:19:01
20 Q Your testimony is that the costs of the 01:19:03
21 self-driving car program from inception to 2015 01:19:08
22 forms the basis for the development costs of Trade 01:19:12
23 Secret 2, Trade Secret 25, and now Trade Secret 90? 01:19:16
24 A My understanding is that -- that since 01:19:23
25 inception through the year that you just identified 01:19:25

1 informs the [REDACTED] number that was placed into 01:19:27
2 this interrogatory. 01:19:31
3 Q For each of those three trade secrets that 01:19:32
4 we have discussed so far? 01:19:34
5 A Correct. That period of spend is what 01:19:36
6 informed that number. And if I may add. The one 01:19:38
7 thing, like -- and we had reviewed this a little bit 01:19:41
8 earlier in the deposition. Is that -- to the extent 01:19:43
9 that there are historical expenses not captured, 01:19:45
10 that number is potentially higher. 01:19:47
11 But because of the way the Alphabet 01:19:50
12 structure was run historically, et cetera, 01:19:52
13 et cetera, that number is -- is reported lower in 01:19:54
14 the Exhibit 1400, I think, is the one that -- that's 01:20:00
15 the spreadsheet so... 01:20:04
16 Q To clarify, you're saying that the 01:20:12
17 number -- the [REDACTED] number that's shown in 01:20:14
18 Exhibit 1400 is actually lower than the actual spend 01:20:20
19 of the program from inception to 2015? 01:20:23
20 A Correct. Correct. As I mentioned 01:20:25
21 earlier, there are -- there are equity that's 01:20:26
22 missing from this, as well as, like, the 01:20:28
23 intracompany expenses of the allocated expensive. 01:20:30
24 Because, again, alphabetization, which is that 01:20:33
25 spinout, was something that happened later. 01:20:36

1 Q What is the cost of developing Trade 01:20:40
2 Secret 2, Trade Secret 25, and Trade Secret 90? 01:20:42
3 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:20:46
4 A So to the extent that the expert has 01:20:48
5 surmised that development of that trade secret is 01:20:55
6 something that is kind of program inception to the 01:20:58
7 date that, again, this comes to, like, fruition or 01:21:02
8 whatever you want to call it, it -- it is that 01:21:04
9 1 point -- it is the spend for the entirety of the 01:21:08
10 program from that inception to the date that that's 01:21:11
11 cut off at, which is 2015 or '16, based on the 01:21:14
12 spreadsheet. 01:21:19
13 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Given that the entirety of 01:21:19
14 the program cost from inception to 2015 is about 01:21:21
15 [REDACTED], would it be fair to say that the costs 01:21:28
16 of developing Trade Secret 2 is the same as the cost 01:21:31
17 of developing Trade Secrets 2, 25, and 90 together? 01:21:35
18 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:21:40
19 A You're asking: Is -- is the cost of 01:21:43
20 developing -- is the cost of developing one, the 01:21:45
21 same as the cost of developing all of them? 01:21:49
22 Q (BY MS. CHANG) All three of them that we 01:21:53
23 just discussed. 01:21:54
24 A I -- like, I don't know that I understand? 01:21:56
25 Like, is the cost the same? I mean, I guess my 01:22:08

1 answer would be that -- that they're all 01:22:20

2 wholly-integrated solutions in the system. And 01:22:24

3 like, this is (inaudible), like, a self-driving 01:22:26

4 system, so -- 01:22:26

5 THE COURT REPORTER: What is that? This 01:22:34

6 is? 01:22:34

7 A Sorry? 01:22:35

8 THE COURT REPORTER: They're 01:22:35

9 wholly-integrated solutions in the system. And 01:22:35

10 like? 01:22:35

11 A They're all wholly-integrated solutions in 01:22:35

12 the same system is what I meant to say. That -- 01:22:38

13 sorry. I lost my train of thought. 01:22:48

14 Q (BY MS. CHANG) You're the corporate -- 01:22:52

15 A Yeah. 01:22:55

16 Q -- representative on the cost of each of 01:22:55

17 the trade secrets? 01:22:56

18 A Right. 01:22:58

19 Q And I'm just trying to figure out how this 01:22:58

20 cost calculation works. You're testifying that 01:23:01

21 Trade Secret 2 costs [REDACTED] which is the 01:23:05

22 entire program cost from inception to 2015. 01:23:09

23 You're testifying that Trade Secret 25 01:23:13

24 costs [REDACTED] which is also the cost of the 01:23:16

25 entire program from inception to 2015. 01:23:23

1 And you're also claiming that Trade 01:23:25
2 Secret 90 costs [REDACTED], which is the cost of 01:23:27
3 the entire program from inception to 2015. 01:23:34
4 Because you're claiming the entire program 01:23:39
5 cost for each of these trade secrets, I want to 01:23:42
6 understand that if it's your testimony that the cost 01:23:47
7 of developing all three trade secrets is also the 01:23:50
8 entire cost of the program from inception to 2015. 01:23:53
9 MR. MACK: Objection, form; beyond the 01:23:58
10 scope. 01:23:59
11 A I -- I don't know that I know how to 01:24:01
12 answer that. Because, again, like, given they all 01:24:04
13 have an interplay and -- and are all required, I -- 01:24:07
14 I don't think I -- I -- I have the technical 01:24:11
15 know-how to -- to -- to answer, like, if you 01:24:13
16 developed one wholly independently versus all of the 01:24:16
17 others, what would the costs be. 01:24:19
18 Q (BY MS. CHANG) That's not my question. 01:24:23
19 A I'm sorry. All right. I'm just having a 01:24:26
20 hard understanding -- 01:24:28
21 Q Yeah. 01:24:29
22 A -- to be honest. 01:24:29
23 Q Well -- so maybe -- I think there are two 01:24:30
24 potential answers to this question, and there could 01:24:36
25 also be an alternate answer. One potential answer 01:24:38

Page 111

1 is because I'm already claiming the entire cost of 01:24:44
2 the program for -- for one of the trade secrets, 01:24:48
3 there's not more that I could claim for developing 01:24:50
4 all three. 01:24:53

5 Or you could say because I'm claiming 01:24:53
6 [REDACTED] for one trade secret, [REDACTED] for 01:24:58
7 another trade secret, and [REDACTED] for a third 01:25:02
8 trade secret, that the cost of developing all three 01:25:07
9 of those would be [REDACTED], even though that 01:25:09
10 exceeds the costs of the entire program. 01:25:12

11 I just want to know what your testimony 01:25:17
12 is. I -- if I wanted to figure out what is the cost 01:25:18
13 of developing three of these trade secrets that are 01:25:22
14 still at issue in this case, is it just -- 01:25:25

15 A Can -- I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Like, I 01:25:28
16 want -- I want -- I want to make sure I understand. 01:25:29
17 Could I -- could I restate it back to you so that, 01:25:30
18 like -- like, you're essentially posing a 01:25:33
19 hypothetical of: If you developed only one of these 01:25:36
20 trade secrets, how much would it cost versus if you 01:25:38
21 developed all three at the same time? 01:25:41

22 Q It's not a hypothetical, because Waymo has 01:25:42
23 responded that developing one trade secret costs 01:25:45
24 [REDACTED] 01:25:48

25 A Right. 01:25:49

1 Q That's not a hypothetical. That's Waymo's 01:25:50
2 response. 01:25:52
3 A Sure. 01:25:52
4 Q And you're Waymo's corporate 01:25:53
5 representative to give that testimony. 01:25:54
6 A Right. 01:25:56
7 Q My question is: Is the cost the same for 01:25:58
8 all three trade secrets -- if -- if I -- is the cost 01:26:01
9 of developing Trade Secret 2 the same as the cost of 01:26:08
10 developing Trade Secrets 2, 25, and 90? 01:26:11
11 MR. MACK: Objection, form; beyond the 01:26:14
12 scope. 01:26:15
13 A Again, to the extent they're identified as 01:26:16
14 the same number, then this is -- like, between the 01:26:19
15 responses for the individual trade secrets, the same 01:26:23
16 number is identified. Like, that's in -- in the 01:26:26
17 answer. So I -- 01:26:28
18 Q (BY MS. CHANG) I understand. 01:26:29
19 A -- don't know what else you're asking me 01:26:30
20 add to that. 01:26:33
21 Q So for each -- you have -- you have 01:26:34
22 identified a cost for each one -- for each trade 01:26:34
23 secret; is that correct? 01:26:37
24 A Right. They're -- in -- in the Responses 01:26:39
25 to Interrogatories, there's a cost identified for 01:26:40

1 MR. MACK: Objection, form; beyond the 02:29:34
2 scope. 02:29:34
3 A Again -- so you're saying if it finishes 02:29:46
4 in a period, like, in the -- in the -- in the 02:29:50
5 between period, are there expenses that are backed 02:29:52
6 out? 02:29:56
7 Q (BY MS. CHANG) My question is: If 02:29:58
8 development actually ends in the middle of a 02:30:01
9 month -- 02:30:04
10 A Okay. 02:30:05
11 Q -- by including the cost through the end 02:30:06
12 of the month, are you overstating that development 02:30:09
13 cost? 02:30:13
14 MR. MACK: Same objections. 02:30:14
15 A I mean, hypothetical -- hypothetically, I -- 02:30:15
16 like, I think it's -- it's -- it's a potential -- 02:30:20
17 there's a potential that if something is done 02:30:25
18 earlier, then it's not done later. I guess that's 02:30:28
19 what I'm understanding you saying. 02:30:31
20 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Let's say the development 02:30:33
21 cost -- 02:30:35
22 A Right. 02:30:35
23 Q -- for December 2013 -- the month of 02:30:35
24 December 2013 is a hundred thousand dollars. 02:30:38
25 A Okay. 02:30:43

1 Q Let's say development actually ends 02:30:44
2 somewhere in the month -- 02:30:47
3 A Okay. 02:30:49
4 Q -- somewhere in the middle of the month. 02:30:50
5 A All right. 02:30:53
6 Q Would claiming a \$100,000 development cost 02:30:54
7 for December 2013 overstate the actual cost? 02:30:59
8 MR. MACK: Objection, form; beyond the 02:31:06
9 scope. 02:31:06
10 A Again, it -- you would have to make a 02:31:07
11 whole series of other assumptions that, in fact, the 02:31:09
12 work -- the work and the dollars that are flowing 02:31:11
13 through in that later period are not attributable to 02:31:15
14 work that has already been completed that -- to 02:31:18
15 enable -- to enable -- in order -- in order to be 02:31:19
16 able to, like, differentiate, right. 02:31:21
17 Something about, you know, the way the 02:31:21
18 books are closed is they represent liabilities that 02:31:24
19 are indiscernibly captured in -- within a period. 02:31:26
20 So if you somehow sliced in a bright line 02:31:31
21 that everything is done, et cetera, and every single 02:31:36
22 person invoiced exactly on time as soon as it was 02:31:39
23 done, all of those things, then that's a 02:31:42
24 possibility, assuming there's a whole other set of 02:31:44
25 things potentially that have to go right to be able 02:31:47

1 to do that. 02:31:50

2 There is a possibility. I think the 02:31:51

3 circumstances would have to be very clear in that 02:31:53

4 situation. 02:31:57

5 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Do you know when 02:31:57

6 development of Trade Secret 7 was actually 02:32:00

7 completed? Trade Secret 7 claims a development cost 02:32:06

8 of [REDACTED] 02:32:11

9 MR. MACK: Objection, form; beyond the 02:32:14

10 scope. 02:32:14

11 A I -- I don't have the technical expertise 02:32:15

12 to -- to say when development of that trade secret 02:32:18

13 was completed, no. 02:32:21

14 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Trade Secret 9 also claims 02:32:24

15 a development cost of [REDACTED]. Do you know 02:32:26

16 when development of Trade Secret 9 was actually 02:32:29

17 completed? 02:32:34

18 MR. MACK: Same objections. 02:32:36

19 A So same -- same answer as the preceding 02:32:37

20 one. 02:32:40

21 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Trade Secret 13 claims a 02:32:40

22 development cost of [REDACTED]. Do you know when 02:32:43

23 development of Trade Secret 13 was actually 02:32:48

24 completed? 02:32:51

25 MR. MACK: Same objections. 02:32:51

1 A The same answer. And -- and to just kind 02:32:52
2 of clarify generally, I don't know the precise 02:32:55
3 period in which a given -- I don't have the 02:32:58
4 technical expertise to say when a precise 02:33:00
5 development of any trade secret was completed. 02:33:02
6 I -- I do understand that based off of 02:33:06
7 the -- the expertise, that the calculation 02:33:08
8 represents periods that have ended in the various 02:33:11
9 respective endpoints, which we have discussed in the 02:33:15
10 preceding questions. 02:33:17
11 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Is your testimony the same 02:33:20
12 for all the trade secrets that you do not know when 02:33:22
13 actual development for any of the nine trade secrets 02:33:26
14 at issue was actually completed? 02:33:29
15 MR. MACK: Objection, form; beyond the 02:33:34
16 scope. 02:33:34
17 A Correct. I do not have the technical 02:33:36
18 expertise to know when the -- the formula -- the 02:33:38
19 formulation, I think was the word you used, of 02:33:40
20 the -- the trade secrets was completed for any of 02:33:43
21 them. 02:33:46
22 What I do understand and know is that the 02:33:47
23 numbers in the responses to the interrogatories 02:33:49
24 represent the various time periods which we have 02:33:53
25 just discussed and that the numbers that I have 02:33:55

1 pointed out in -- in the data that we have provided 02:33:58
2 in Exhibit -- Exhibit 1400. 02:34:01
3 Q (BY MS. CHANG) To clarify, I asked about 02:34:03
4 when development of each of the trade secrets was 02:34:05
5 completed. 02:34:09
6 A Right. And -- and what I'm saying is to 02:34:10
7 the extent that I understand what informed the 02:34:12
8 number, that would be how I would understand that to 02:34:14
9 be true -- an ending would have occurred. Like, it 02:34:18
10 would have been complete -- formulation would be 02:34:22
11 complete. 02:34:26
12 Q Your understanding of when each of the 02:34:28
13 trade secrets completed development coincides with 02:34:30
14 the end period used to form the basis of the 02:34:36
15 calculation for the development cost? 02:34:44
16 MR. MACK: Objection, form; beyond the 02:34:48
17 scope. 02:34:48
18 A That would be my nontechnical 02:34:49
19 understanding. 02:34:52
20 Q (BY MS. CHANG) As an example, Trade 02:34:52
21 Secret 2 claims a development cost of [REDACTED], 02:34:54
22 which you testified was based on the entire program 02:35:01
23 spend for Waymo's self-driving system from inception 02:35:06
24 to 2015. 02:35:10
25 Based on that calculation, your 02:35:13

1 understanding is that Trade Secret 2 completed its 02:35:20
2 development in December 2015; is that right? 02:35:23
3 MR. MACK: Objection, form; beyond the 02:35:27
4 scope. 02:35:27
5 A That would be my nontechnical 02:35:29
6 understanding. 02:35:32
7 Q (BY MS. CHANG) I'm handing you what was 02:35:38
8 previously marked as Exhibit 1079. Exhibit 1079 is 02:35:40
9 Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Jordan Jaffe in 02:36:11
10 support of Waymo's Motion for Preliminary 02:36:19
11 Injunction. I can represent that to you. 02:36:21
12 If you turn to the second page, this 02:36:26
13 document is identified as "Plaintiff's List of 02:36:31
14 Asserted Trade Secrets Pursuant to California Code 02:36:34
15 Civil Procedure Section 2019.210. 02:36:39
16 Do you recognize this document? 02:36:43
17 A No. 02:36:48
18 Q You have never seen this document before? 02:36:48
19 A No. 02:36:50
20 Q If you turn to page 2 of Exhibit 1079, it 02:37:25
21 reads, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] 02:37:50

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 02:38:18
10 See supra paragraph 1, second bullet, for 02:38:22
11 reasonable steps -- steps taken to maintain secrecy. 02:38:26
12 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 02:38:59
19 Is this the first time that you're seeing 02:39:07
20 a description of Trade Secret 2? 02:39:10
21 A Yes. 02:39:12
22 Q Do you know if Waymo's self-driving car 02:39:18
23 system has components other than [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 02:39:34

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
3 [REDACTED] 02:39:43
4 MR. MACK: Objection, form; beyond the 02:39:45
5 scope. 02:39:45
6 A Is -- if I could kind of try to synthesize 02:39:52
7 your question a bit. Like, essentially is -- is 02:39:56
8 there more to the self-driving system than a LiDAR? 02:39:58
9 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Yes. And specifically the 02:40:03
10 LiDAR described in the last bullet point of 02:40:04
11 paragraph -- paragraph 2. 02:40:07
12 MR. MACK: Same objections. 02:40:10
13 A Again, I'm not technically trained or -- 02:40:10
14 and I'm -- my general layman's understanding is that 02:40:14
15 there is more to our self-driving system than a 02:40:18
16 LiDAR, yes. 02:40:21
17 Q (BY MS. CHANG) If you turn to page 5, 02:40:23
18 Trade Secret 7 is listed on page 5. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] 02:41:14

EXHIBIT 4

**REDACTED VERSION
OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT
TO BE SEALED**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

---oOo---

WAYMO LLC,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;

OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING,

INC.,

Defendants.

/

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

WAYMO LLC RULE 30(b)(6)
VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF PIERRE-YVES DROZ
PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, AUGUST 3, 2017

REPORTED BY:

ANDREA M. IGNACIO, CSR, RPR, CRR, CCRR, CLR ~

CSR LICENSE NO. 9830

JOB NO. 2663199

PAGES 1 - 371

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

---oOo---

WAYMO LLC,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;

OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING,

INC.,

Defendants.

/

Videotaped Deposition of Pierre-Yves Droz
taken on behalf of the Defendant, on August 3,
2017, at Morrison & Foerster LLP, 950 Page Mill
Road, Palo Alto, California, beginning 9:27 a.m.,
and commencing at 7:25 p.m., Pursuant to Notice,
and before me, ANDREA M. IGNACIO, CSR, RPR, CRR,
CLR ~ License No. 9830.

1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
3 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
4 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
5 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED] 13:33
13 MR. KIM: All right. 13:33
14 Q So I -- I don't understand why you're saying 13:33
15 from your personal knowledge. You know, we -- we 13:33
16 looked earlier at your deposition topics. 13:33
17 A Yep. Okay. 13:33
18 Q And Exhibit 1273 specifically asks for the 13:33
19 time cost and specific people involved in developing 13:33
20 each of the alleged trade secrets. 13:33
21 MR. JAFFE: Which topic are you reading from? 13:33
22 MR. KIM: Deposition Topic No. 9. 13:33
23 Q And so I'm asking you about the -- the cost 13:33
24 to implement [REDACTED] -- 13:33
25 A So, are you asking what -- 13:34

1 THE WITNESS: Sorry. Go ahead. 13:34

2 MR. JAFFE: One -- one second here. 13:34

3 THE WITNESS: Yes. 13:34

4 MR. JAFFE: So, Mr. Droz is here subject to 13:34

5 our objections. As I stated at the outset of this 13:34

6 deposition, he's designated on the development of the 13:34

7 | asserted trade secrets other than 25. So I just want 13:34

8 to make that clear for the record. 13:34

9	Go ahead.	13:34
---	-----------	-------

10 THE WITNESS: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

--	--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

[illegible]

[illegible]

13:35

25 MR. JAFFE: Objection; form; outside the 13:35

1 scope. 13:35

2 THE WITNESS: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED] 13:35

10 MR. KIM: Q. So, you're not prepared to talk 13:35

11 about the cost of development of Trade Secret No. 2 as 13:35

12 Waymo's corporate designated witness; is that correct? 13:35

13 A I'm not. 13:35

14 (Document marked Exhibit 1278 13:36

15 for identification.) 13:36

16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 1278. 13:36

17 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 13:36

18 MR. KIM: So I've marked for identification, 13:36

19 as Exhibit No. 1278, an e-mail from John McCauley at 13:36

20 Quinn Emanuel, dated Wednesday, August 2nd, 2017, at 13:36

21 7:56 p.m. 13:36

22 Q And, if you look at the second paragraph, it 13:36

23 says: 13:36

24 "Waymo designates Mr. Droz to testify with 13:36

25 regard to Topics 9 and 10 of Uber's second 30(b)(6) 13:37